മിസ്റ്റർ ഔസെപ് പി. കുണ്ടുകുളം.—മിസ്സസ് അന്നമ്മയെ വെച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതു് സെൻറ ജോൺസ്സ്കൂളിലേക്കു മാത്രമായിട്ടാണൊ എന്നറിഞ്ഞാൽ കൊള്ളാം.

റാവു സാഹിബ്ബ് മിസ്റ്റർ സി. മത്തായി.—അതു റിക്കാട്ട് നോക്കണം.

മിസ്റ്റർ ഔസെപ് പി. കുണ്ടുകുളം.—ഫ്രഠ൦ര്-ൽ മുഴുവൻ ഗ്രാൻറ് ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നതു് പിന്നെ പകുതിയെ സാങ്ഷൻ ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ളു. സ്കൂളിൽ കൂട്ടികൾ ധാരാളം ഉണ്ടു്. മുഴുവൻ വ്യ്ക്കുള്ള ഒരു നീഡിൽ വ്യ്ക്കു മിസ്സസ്സിനെ കൊടുക്കരുതെ?

റാവു സാഹിബ്ബ് മിസ്റ്റർ സി. മത്തായി —സാധാരണ ആട്ടത്ത സ്കൂളുകളും കൂടി ചേക്കാറുണ്ടു്.

മിസ്റ്റർ ഔസെപ് പി. കുണ്ടുകുളം.—അകലേയായാലൊ.

റാവു സാഹിബ്ബ് മിസ്റ്റർ സി. മത്തായി.—അതിനു തരമില്ല. ചിലവു ധികമാകും. സാധാരണ എങ്ങിനെയാണെന്നുവെച്ചാൽ പാട്ട ഫ്രം ടയ്ിംവ്യ്ക്കു തുയിട്ടെ കൊടുക്കാറുള്ളു. നീഡിൽ വ്യ്ക്കു പകുതിയും.

മിസ്റ്റർ ഔസെപ് പി. കുണ്ടുകുളം.—മറിച്ചാക്കിയാലെന്താ?

റാവു സാഹിബ്ബ് മിസ്റ്റർ സി. മത്തായി.—പാട്ടിനാണ് അധ്യാനം കൂടുതൽ. മറിച്ചു വേണമെന്നാവശ്യമുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ എഴുതി അയച്ചാൽ ആലോചിക്കാം.

Cochin Tanneries.

251. Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(1) what interest the Government has in the Cochin Tanneries, Ltd.;

(a) as a share-holder, (b) as a creditor;

(2) whether the floatation of the Company was not decided upon in a conference of the representatives of the public of Cochin presided over by the Diwan in the Krishna Vilas in 1095;

(3) whether the leather expert Mr. Raghava Kurup was not got down by the Diwan for the express purpose of starting the Tanneries here;

(4) whether Mr. Kurup did not resign his job in Calcutta where he was employed;

(5) how mnay Government Directors are there on the Board

(6) are the Proceedings of the Board of Directors regularly; sent up to Government;

(7) whether the Tanneries is not the only concern started in Cochin whose capital was over-subscribed;

(8) when did the Company stop manufacturing leather;

(9) whether there were complaints regarding the inadequate supply of raw hides and skins;

(10) whether the finished leather had no markets;

(11) whether the experience of its workings did not show a progressive sale of the Factory's output;

(12) what is the maximum number ever tanned by the Factory per day during the time it worked;

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(13) what is the maximum number of hides and skin that the Factory was equipped to tan per day;

(14) what, according to expert opinion, is the reason for the failure of the Company ;

(15) was its working ever got enquired into by an independent expert; at whose instance was theinvestigation into its working conducted by Mr. Guthre of the Madras Industries Department and by Mr. Butler and with what object; has Mr. Butler any experience in tanning; who paid for the investigation in each case and how much ;

(16) whether the Government had made any promise to give a loan to the Company, if Mr. Guthre's report was favourable; if not, why was it undertaken ;

(17) whether the reports of the above two experts did not show that the Factory could be profitably worked ;

(18) (a) did not the Company after Mr. Guthre's report request the Government for a loan for its working; (b) did not the Company offer to hand over the Factory to Government for being worked according to Government's ideas and under its control; (c) when was such written request made; (d) what was Government's reply; (e) was it ever communicated to the Company; and if so, when;

(19) was not Pandit Malavya, when he lately visited Cochin, taken to the Factory by the Secretary to the Diwan and the Government Directors; what opinion regarding its working did he record in the Visitors' Book;

(20) what recommendation did the Economic Development Board of Cochin make to Government regarding its working after the Pandit's visit and the receipt of Mr. Butler's report; what orders did Government pass on the said recommendations ;

(21) has the Government instituted a suit in the Anjikaimal District Court against the Company for realising the loan made to the Company; was the suit instituted before or after the Pandit's visit and Mr. Butler's report·

(22) did the Economic Development Board recommend that the suit already instituted may be withdrawn and the Factory worked with Government aided capital; what is the decision of the Government thereon;

(23) was the Government Advocate and Legal Adviser to Government consulted in the matter of suing the Company ; if not, which other legal officer was consulted ;

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

(24) did the Government receive any complaint regarding the working of the Company from any Travancore share-holder through the Diwan of Travancore; and if so, when ;

(25) what were the forwarding remarks of the said Diwan ; what action did our Government take or what reply did it give regarding the said complaint?

Mr. K. Krishna Pisharodi.—(1) (a) To the extent of Rs. 1,20,000.

(b) Rs. 1,21,755-0-9, as a principal and Rs. 47,339-0-6 by way of interest up to 1st July 1929.

(2) Yes.

(3) Mr. Kurup applied, and he was appointed.

(4) Not known.

(5) Three.

(6) Government cannot answer for certain whether all the Proceedings on the matter have been received.

(7) Not known.

(8) to (13). The Company has to be addressed for the information required.

(14) Vide answer to part two of question No. 41 of the Budget Session of 1103.

(15) Yes.

Mr. Guthre was got down at the instance of the Government with the approval of the Company to go into the working of the Company and suggest remedies. He was paid Rs. 701-5-0 by the Company. Mr. Butler was brought down at the instance of the official Directors by the Managing Agents of the Company to report on the Company's present condition and the possibility of reviving it. He had ample practical experience in the line. Government have no information what he was paid by the Company.

(16) No promise of loan was made.

(17) Yes ; with drastic changes in several respects by a further investment of capital.

(18) (a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) On 6th February 1926.

(d) The reply was that the Government were unwilling to take over management.

(e) It was communicated to the General Manager orally in an interview with the Diwan in June 1926.

(19) Yes.

A copy of the remarks is appended. (*Vide Appendix II.*)

(20) Recommended a more detailed investigation by Mr. Butler himself and also of re-starting the concern with certain changes in management, etc.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

The Government before receipt of these recommendations had sanctioned the institution of a suit against the Company, and the Board's recommendations could not, therefore, be given practical effect to.

(21) Yes; after the visit and the report.

(22) Yes.

That the suit was instituted after mature deliberation and could not be withdrawn at that stage.

(23) The Anjikaimal Sirkar Vakil was consulted.

(24) Yes, on 27th August 1928.

(25) Government regret that they cannot publish the correspondence.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Was Mr. Raghava Kurup the only applicant for this post?

Mr. K. Krishna Pisharodi.—There is no information.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Was he employed elsewhere when he made the application?

President.—He was.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—And did he resign his post when he came here?

President.—He was in Calcutta. Without resigning how can we appoint him?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—The answer is 'we do not know.'

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Was this capital oversubscribed? Why are these Government Directors there, what is their duty?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—To look after the shares which the Government have taken in the Company.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Are they not to report to the Government?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—If necessary, they will report.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Can they not give the necessary information?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—But these are matters relating to a private Company, and the Government do not know how the Government, in the capacity of a share-holder, will be correct in giving out the information regarding the Company. It would be better if the Company itself is addressed, and the Company will give the information, if they think that it is right.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—There are Government officers there who are Directors, and Government money is invested there.

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—Yes.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Can they not get the information if they want?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—They may get the information, But they do not know if they will be absolutely correct in giving the information regarding a Company in which their interest is only that of a share-holder. (*Hear, hear.*)

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Was any lawyer notice given to the Company before the suit was instituted?

President.—Notice was given.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—When the Company promised to hand over the Company to Government, why did not they take it up?

President.—They did not want to take it up. Government did not think that it would be justified in assuming the management of the Company, and so the Government refused to take up the management.

Chalakkudi Potteries.

252. Mr. P. Krishna Menon.—Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(1) whether the Chalakkudi Potteries has re-started work;

(2) (i) whether the Hon'ble Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya did not visit both these Factories; and

(ii) record practically identical opinion with regard to the future working of both the Tanneries, Ltd. and Potteries;

(3) whether the Economic Development Board did not recommend to the Government the withdrawing of the suit, if it had been filed by the time of the recommendation;

(4) what orders, if any, have been passed on the recommendation;

(5) in case of the sale of the Tanneries Ltd., do not the Government stand to lose almost the same amount of money as they have invested in the Potteries, in addition to an equal amount by the people of Cochin?

Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon.—(1) The Factory never stopped work.

(2) (i) Yes.

(ii) It is a matter of opinion.

(3) Yes.

(4) Vide answer to part 22 of question No. 251.

(5) Government cannot say.

Mr. P. Krishna Menon.—Answer to (1). Are we to understand that any or all of the kilns were continuously working from the start?

Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon.—That answer does not suggest that inference.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly